



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, March, 1898.

THE FIFTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

THE Modern Language Association of America held its fifteenth annual meeting Dec. 27-29, at the University of Pennsylvania. The programme included an afternoon and evening session on Dec. 27th, a morning and afternoon session Dec. 28th, and a morning session Dec. 29th. By courtesy of the officers of the Houston Club, the auditorium of Houston Hall was used as the official headquarters of the Association.

The Association was called to order by the President, Professor Albert S. Cook of Yale University. The reports of the Secretary, Professor James W. Bright, and of the Treasurer, Professor Herbert E. Greene, both of Johns Hopkins University, having been received, and other routine business disposed of, the first paper of the session upon "The New Requirements in Entrance English" was read by Professor T. W. Hunt of Princeton University. This paper will appear later in full in the columns of this Journal.

The second paper was by Professor Henry Wood of Johns Hopkins University upon "The close of Goethe's *Tasso* as a literary problem," of which the following is an abstract.

Speculations as to Tasso's future, drawn from the play itself, Professor Wood said, are nugatory. Biographical side-lights, based on the equation Goethe-Tasso and Frau von Stein-Princess Leonore, will always retain a certain shifting but real interest, defying precise statement though never to be denied. But Leonore of Este is a pietist of the renaissance, a character foreign to Frau von Stein. Goethe fixed the type of the pietistic grand lady in his *Wilhelm Meister*. It is found in the Countess, her family and environment. This character, conceived and worked out for the novel during the years of Goethe's initial interest in Tasso (1781-83), represents a new

creation in literature. It became at once the literary prototype of Princess Leonore in the drama.

Both the Princess and Wilhelm's Countess are "schöne Seelen," revealing the "grosse Welt" to their lovers, who worship them from afar with "stille Neigung." Each author is admitted to the boudoir, to recite his productions. Mistaking tender sympathy for complaisance, each surprises his lady and himself into a wild embrace. Brought to his senses by the womanly and resolute "Hinweg!" each hears with despair the rumble of the carriage wheels bearing his injured patroness away from the rural retreat, with no farewell said.

Both Princess Leonore and the Countess, 'sick and lost to this world,' sink into a condition of tender melancholy and pietistic inertia. In the one case the influence proceeds from Herrnhut, in the other from "die Stillen im Lande," who give character to the 'evangelical renaissance' at the Court of Ferrara. This entirely new view of Leonore's surroundings and character is abundantly confirmed by the indirect evidence contained in books like Jules Bonnet's *Aonio Paleario* and *Olympia Morata*, and Benrath's *Bernhardino Ochino*. Leonore of Este in the play is the pietistic German "Weltdame," with an Italian coloring. The early part of *Wilhelm Meister* is a character study for the drama. Goethe's Princess represents in a dramatic figure the consummate unification of what in the novel was still a complex type, appearing in the "schöne Seele" of the *Confessions*, and her two nieces, the Countess and Natalie.

The same result was achieved in the case of the minor characters. The Baroness in *Wilhelm Meister* is a rudimentary sketch of Leonore of Sanvitale, the "verschmitzte kleine Mittlerin" of Tasso's unjust accusations. Jarno is an equally unmistakable, though fragmentary, study for the character of Antonio.

By vouchsafing a future to Wilhelm, rescuing him 'so as by fire,' Goethe has in a certain sense granted both hero and heroine in *Tasso* a new existence under more favorable conditions. Not Tasso reappears but his German counterpart, the defeated lover of a second

Leonore, who this time wins in his conflict with the world, for himself and for his "schöne Seele." Goethe is not satisfied until the literary characters that owe their origin to his own experiences have been allotted in his works the full measure of a rounded life. What they thus lose in dramatic intensity, they gain as examples of the fulness and complexity of modern culture.

The results of the present study are claimed to be: first, proof of a close connection in character and incident between *Tasso* and the early chapters of *Wilhelm Meister*; second, the establishment of complete literary identity between Goethe's pietistic "Weltdamen" in the novel and his Princess Leonore of Este as the literary centre of the evangelical mystical renaissance at Ferrara; third, the substitution in one instance of a new canon of the survival and development of literary types in Goethe, in place of the shifting and evanescent personal types hitherto assumed.

The paper which was to follow, by Dr. Thérèse F. Colin of Bryn Mawr College, upon "The phraseology of Molière's *Précieuses Ridicules* historically considered," was not read, but a brief abstract may be given here. Molière was charged by his contemporaries with having grossly satirized the *Précieuses* and with having made his characters use extravagant language of his own invention. The purpose of the paper was to determine how much truth there was in this assertion. From a study of the writers of the time, Dr. Colin has sought to define the language of the *Précieuses*, to note its sources and the ridiculous abuse into which its imitation led, finding, it would seem for Molière's justification, a sufficient number of parallel passages which may have furnished him with the very expressions so bitterly criticized in 1659 when the play was first performed.

The fourth paper by Professor John E. Matzke of Leland Stanford Junior University upon "The question of free and checked vowels in Gallic Popular Latin," was to have been read by Professor L. E. Menger of Bryn Mawr University, but Professor Menger in view of the difficulty of presenting the paper in detail properly, gave instead a summary of Dr. Matzke's views, and a statement regarding his own position as at variance with and as criticized by Professor Matzke.

The main point of Dr. Matzke's paper was that a definition of the terms "free" and "checked" must be based on the forms of words as existing in Popular Latin. The vowels in these words developed according to a principle elaborated by ten Brink: all vowels in open syllables, not already long, become lengthened, all vowels in closed syllables, not already short, become shortened. The time for the action of this law has been determined by Pogatscher and Mackel to be the sixth century. Therefore, the definition of "free" and "checked" must be restricted to the forms of words as existing at this date.

Dr. Menger, in his remarks on the paper, suggested that it is probably impossible to make any general statement of the question that will include all cases of vowel development in French. The nearest approach to such a statement is that of Schwan-Behrens. He said that in the sixth century only *e* and *g* had developed. The other vowels did not begin to develop until the eighth century. When they did develop they did so as influenced by consonantal conditions of the latter century without regard to the sixth. If we limit our definition to this century we exclude the influence of palatals, which, for the most part did not begin altering until after this date. He asked if we are not interested in causes that really did determine the fate of vowels, rather than in their condition at a time when they had not altered materially or in all cases, so far as we can judge, from the value they possessed even in Classical Latin.

Dr. Menger questioned the justice of restricting the action of ten Brink's law to the sixth century; he understood it as referring to a general tendency in Romance, that was apt to manifest itself during any of the centuries of the formative period. Dr. Menger stated his belief that if we wish a statement that will cover all cases at all times, we shall have to vary the statement according to the cases and the times; that is, the question is a chronological one, and its full determination must probably go hand in hand with the separate determination of the first indications of change on the part of each vowel. In controlling the dates of such changes, the most important aid will be found in comparing the one with the alterations of the palatals, and until the exact stages and times of the de-

velopments of the latter are known, further advance in our knowledge of Old French vowel developments is hardly to be hoped for.

The next paper was by Professor Felix E. Schelling of the University of Pennsylvania upon "Ben Jonson and the Classical School." Starting with the antithetical terms "romantic" and "classical," and affirming the co-existence of both classic and romantic art in all ages, as elements of differing intensity, Professor Schelling pointed out three manifestations of the classical spirit in literature in the period from the Renaissance to the reign of Queen Anne. These are 1. the empirical classicism of Sir Philip Sidney, busy with externals such as theorizing upon the Greek unities, and the introduction of classical measures into English verse; 2. the assimilative classicism of Ben Jonson, based on that poet's temperament and deep scholarship; and 3. the pseudo- or conventionalized classicism of Alexander Pope.

A contrast was then drawn between the manner of Spenser, that is, Spenser's way of imitating and interpreting nature artistically by means of poetic expression, and the manner of Jonson. Spenser was chosen as the representative, as he was the leader of a large school of poets, his contemporaries and successors, and his manner was described in brief as consisting of a sensuous love of beauty involving the power of pictorial representation, a use of classical imagery for decorative effect, a fondness for melody of a flowing sweetness and continuousness of diction, involving at times diffuseness. In contrast the manner of Jonson displays a sense for form, a sense of finish, reserve and self-control. In a word, the antithesis between the two poets is that of romanticism and classicality.

This was followed by a discussion of Jonson's relations to his time especially in his literary dictatorship. It was shown that the subject matter of Jonson's non-dramatic verse contains practically all the varieties of poetry subsequently practised by Dryden and Pope. It was established that 1. Jonson wielded the greatest literary influence of his time; 2. that this influence was exerted chiefly upon the scholarly and cultivated classes; 3. that this influence extended until long after the Restoration; 4. that it made directly for the classical ideal and lasted while that ideal

lasted. A brief enumeration then followed of existing theories set forth to explain the origin of the transformation that came over English Literature between the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and Queen Anne. It was urged that while the form of versification was of value in indicating the nature of this change, weight must be given to many other considerations.

The second part of this paper was devoted to a discussion of the thesis that not a trait which came to prevail in the poetry of the new classical school can be found that is not directly traceable to the influence and example of Ben Jonson. Attention was called to the attitude of Jonson toward the prevalent literary taste of his age, his contempt for popular judgment, his criticism of his contemporaries (Sidney and Spenser among them) and his objection in general to the romanticism of his day. This position was explained as that of a professional man who had a theory to oppose to the amateurishness and eclecticism of his time. In this respect Jonson's position was stated to be much that of Matthew Arnold in his exclamation: "Amid the bewildering confusion of our times I seemed to myself to find the only sure guidance, the only solid-footing among the ancients." Some of Ben Jonson's theories which betray the classicist were then set forth,—his belief in the rhetoric of Quintilian and in the criticism of Horace, his conviction that English drama must follow the ancients; but these theories were shown to be none the less reasonable and liberal, and his position in general that of a man desirous of applying the canons of the past to conditions which he recognized as different in the present. The restrictions of classicality in practice as contrasted with matters of theory were then considered: among them Jonson's tendency to precise and pointed antithetical diction, his slightly Latinized vocabulary, his occasional preference for abstract over concrete expression, and his somewhat conventionalized metrical form. His practice in this last particular was shown to be entirely in accordance with his theories expressed in his conversations with Drummond, and elsewhere. It was shown that in Jonson's non-dramatic verse the decasyllabic rhymed couplet is all but his constant measure, that in his hands it became the habitual measure for occasional verse, and sanctioned by his usage, remained

such for one hundred and fifty years. It was shown that not only did Jonson's practice and theory thus coincide, but also that the practice of no other poet exemplified like characteristics to anything approaching the same extent until we pass beyond the accession of Charles I.

Illustrations were then given to show the nature of the versification of several poets preceding and contemporary with Jonson. The results of this consideration, [which cannot be given here] show first, a gradual decrease in the number of run-on couplets and run-on lines through Spenser, through Jonson and Dryden to Pope, but they showed also a division of these six poets into two groups with respect to the use and non-use of the continuous line: Sandys, contrary to the usual theory on this subject, showing a close affiliation to the manner of Spenser, and Jonson falling into a group which includes Waller, Dryden, and Pope. A further examination into Jonson's use of antithesis and into other devices of the later classical manner shows that he contained in his versification, as in his style and in his theory, all those qualities which developed to a greater degree came finally to characterize the style and versification of the so called "Classical Age;" and moreover that this could be affirmed of no other poet contemporary with Jonson's earlier career.

In conclusion, attention was called to the liberality of Jonson's spirit despite his own strong preferences, and to the eclecticism of his practice which had much to do, with other influences, in delaying the coming of the following age of restriction. This is especially exemplified in Jonson's two disciples: Robert Herrick and Edmund Waller. Both owed much to Jonson, but Waller especially carried on the classical spirit in the lyric which he impoverished and conventionalized, and in occasional verse, for which he possessed a peculiar talent.

Professor W. T. Hewett of Cornell University then spoke upon "The sources of Goethe's printed text," and upon that of *Hermann und Dorothea* in particular. He first presented a history of the various collected editions of Goethe's works. Starting with the statement that Goedeke in his *Deutsche Dichtung* (1849) was one of the first to call attention to errors in Goethe's printed text, he reviewed the ser-

vices of Professor M. Bernays in tracing the numerous corruptions in the earlier writings, especially in *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers*, *Götz von Berlichingen*, *Stella* and *Clavigo*, to the unauthorized Himgurg editions. The efforts of Seuffert in the *Goethe Jahrbuch*, vol. xv, to determine the relation of the Stuttgart to the Vienna edition of Goethe's *Werke*, B and B', as illustrated in a study of Goethe's "Erzählung," *Die Guten Weiber*, were examined. After showing that a uniform law for the protection of literary property did not exist in Germany before 1837, and how unsuccessful previous efforts in this direction had been, certain sovereigns having favored piratical reprints, Professor Hewett examined the history of the text of a single poem, *Hermann und Dorothea*, giving a summary of the results of a collation of nearly all the printed editions of the poem, about forty-five in number, including many hitherto unknown reprints. It was shown that the contamination of the text began as early as 1798, the year after the publication of the poem, and that these errors were repeated in later unauthorized editions until the first collected edition of the works, 1808 (A), where, in spite of the revision of Goethe, the publisher used as the basis of the text a Reutlingen reprint of 1806, which contained numerous typographical errors, and that these errors were incorporated in all subsequent editions of the poem, and appeared in the collected editions of Goethe's works; namely, in B and B', and in C and C', and thus became a part of the standard text. Only one revision of the poem by the author can be predicated. All other changes are due to the caprices or inaccuracies of proof-readers and compositors. More than twenty readings derived from pirated editions, which have been received into the text, were pointed out. Among the indirect results of the investigation, it was shown that the classification of the dates of publication of the various volumes of the first edition of the *Werke* (A) by the Weimar editors required revision (*Goethe Jahrbuch*, vol. xvi, p. 262); no essential divergence was found in the text of the poem in editions B and B'; and the readings of Egmont given by Strehlke in the Hempel edition of Goethe were verified (see Minor. Goethe's *Werke*, Weimar ed. vol. 8, p. 342).

In the last paper of the session upon the

"Parallel treatment of the vowel *e* in Old French and Provençal," Dr. A. Jodocius, of Philadelphia, gave a summary of the vowel *e* in open and closed syllables both in Old French and Provençal, as well as in their principal dialects, with the differences of pronunciation in the various parts of France. He also cited rimes from the *Donat Proensal*, and the opinions of the principal authorities on the origin of the suffixes, as evidence that the supposed existence of a suffix *erium*, replacing *arium* at an epoch anterior to the formation of any Romanic language, could not explain such forms as *porchier*, *cavallaria*, and others.

In the evening, the Association met in extra session to listen to the address of the President. The Provost of the University, Mr. Charles C. Harrison presided and made an address of welcome to the Association. Professor Cook's subject was "The province of English Philology." His theme was not English philology proper, but the use of the terms "philology" and "philologist" in English. Maintaining the view of Wolf and Boeckh to be the correct one,—that any permanent record of man's intellectual activity is proper to philology, and that any form of study of the spoken, or of the written word, is essentially philologic, the aim of which is in a scientific spirit and with scientific method to reconstruct the past. He made a plea against that current limitation of the term philologist which would make it apply to the linguist only as distinguished from the student of literature, pointing out the antagonism, or apparent antagonism, which necessarily results between the two bodies of workers, despite the fact of their essential unity of aim.

"We must never forget," Professor Cook said in part, "that the philologist is a lover. As Pythagoras was not willing to be called a wise man, but only a lover of wisdom, and thus coined the word philosophy, so the philologist may well be content to call himself a lover, too—a lover of the thrilling and compelling voices of the past. He becomes a philologist, if he is worthy of the name, because they have thrilled and compelled him; and he would fain devise means, however circuitous in appearance, by which to insure that they shall thrill and compel others. His sensibility is the measure of his devotion; and his devotion, while it may not be the measure of his success, is certainly its indispensable condition.

If, then, philology truly considered enlists the head in the service of the heart, if it de-

mands not only high and manifold discipline but rich natural endowment; if its object is the revelation to the present of the spiritual attainments of the past; if it seeks to win free access for the thoughts of the mightiest thinkers and the dreams of the most visionary of poets; if it seeks to train the imagination to recreate the form and pressure of a vanished time, in order to stimulate our own age to equal or surpass its predecessors in whatever best illustrates and ennobles humanity; if there are not wanting numerous examples of poets who have been philologists and philologists who have been essentially poets; and, finally, if philology is the only term which thus fully comprehends these various aspects of a common subject (and we have the most authoritative precedents for employing it in that signification), shall we willingly allow the word to be depreciated and this largeness and unity of the corresponding conception imperiled by consenting to employ it for the designation of a single branch of the comprehensive whole, and that the branch which to the popular apprehension least exhibits the real import and aim of the science? If not, and if we are willing to be known as philologists in the truer and larger sense, can we not do something to make this sense the prevalent one by consistently adhering to it in our practice, and so far as possible, inducing others to accept and adopt it?

"By thus doing we shall not only be recognizing a truth which is indisputable, but also be promoting that harmony of opinions and sentiments without which the most strenuous individual efforts are certain to prove in some degree nugatory."

The second session, Tuesday morning, Dec. 28th, opened with a paper by Dr. Edwin S. Lewis of Princeton University, upon "The morphology of the Guernsey dialect." This paper was the continuation of a study which has appeared in the *Publications* of the Association, dealing with the phonology of the Guernsey dialect. The completed work on the morphology will be published at a later date, only a few of the leading points being mentioned at the Convention. 1. Guernsey words ending in *-e*, from Latin *-ELLUM*, have *-jə* in the plural. This development differs from that in Normandy proper, where are found such products resulting as sing. *-jə* plur. *-jə*, or sing. *-e* plur. *-jā*, or sing. *-jə* plur. *-jā*. In Guernsey there are only two products corresponding to these: *bjə* plur. *bjə* and *vjə* plur. *vjə*. Attention was also called to lengthening in the plural, with its varying developments: *bæ* or *bæf* plur. *bǣ*, *sək* plur. *sē̄*; *ljə* plur. *lī*; *žnłái* plur. *žnłā*; *mīræ* plur. *mīrǣ*;

jēl plur. *jēr*, and these forms were explained. 2. Masculine nouns ending in *-æ* have *-æres* in the feminine, as *sōzæ* fem. *sōzæres*, *filæ* fem. *glæres*, the latter word illustrating, in the masculine, the palatalization of intervocalic *l* immediately preceding the accent. 3. *ü* develops after the sibilant *ʒ* in *ʒü*, *süt*, *šüna*, and also in *žü*, used after the verb. 4. The Guernsey dialect would seem to lend weight to Behrens's argument that in such forms as *avez-vous*, *savez-vous*, the accent was first pushed back to the stem of the verb, thus causing the fall of the ending *-vez*. Gaston Paris's idea was that the accent was first pushed forward to the pronoun.

Various peculiarities of the Guernsey personal pronouns were also mentioned, and argument for the development of *nou* from *l'on* was found in the Guernsey expressions *nou fait*, from Latin *NON FACIT*, and *boudiax*, corresponding to the French *bon Dieu*.

The paper which followed was by Dr. Eva March Tappan of the Worcester English High School, upon "The poetry of Nicolas Breton." It opened with a survey of the great events of the age in which Breton lived and noted their failure to produce any visible effect upon his poetical works. Breton is to be classified as a religious poet who made literary departures into *vers de société*, satire, and pastoral. His *vers de société* received little praise, and its one gem, *A Sweet Lullaby*, was ruthlessly claimed for Gascoigne.

As a satirist, Breton is to be regarded as a literary descendant of Gascoigne, his satire having little in common with that of Hall, Donne, or Marston. His religious verse shows, it was stated, two of the marks of the real hymn. 1. It embodies a real, or seemingly real, individual experience. 2. It manifests no consciousness of the audience. His freedom in religious composition was ascribed to his conventional and uncontroversial disposition, and to the fact that his creed consisted of but three articles, namely: 1. wrong is punished, 2. right is rewarded, 3. repentance wins forgiveness. Breton knew nothing of the theological pessimism of Gascoigne, nothing of the ecstasies of Southwell, nothing of the higher selfishness of Thomas à Kempis, but he was a simple, true-hearted, Christian man, who meant to do his best, and was sorry when he failed. His religious verse, always

tender, sweet and hopeful, developed into rare earnestness, clearness of vision, and an exquisite eagerness of childlike longing and trust. The verbal style of these religious writings shows the delight in words common to all Elizabethans, a proof of their appreciation of a form of life so intangible that we, unhappily, have lost much of their delicate sensitiveness to its existence.

The pastoral of the sixteenth century was in perfect accord with three of the leading tendencies of the age, 1. The inherent English love of nature and simplicity. 2. The healthy liking for the marvellous, fastened by the great events of the age. 3. The keen interest in human nature that was to find its highest development in the drama. Breton's pastoral was regarded as proceeding from love of nature combined with close study of human nature. The interest taken by Elizabeth in his first pastoral, *Phillido and Corydon*, was explained by its possible connection with the Earl of Leicester's entertainment given to the Queen in 1578. The pastoral and erotic verse of Breton was compared with that of Sannazaro, Googe, Surrey, Wyatt, Turberville, Spenser, Lyly, Sidney, and Gascoigne. His association with Gascoigne was treated as being probably more intimate than is generally supposed.

Breton's independence of character and his intellectual modesty were next discussed. His popularity with the same audience that admired far greater poets was ascribed, aside from his literary merits, 1. to his following the literary lines of least resistance, 2. to his power to please an unusually varied audience, resulting from his ability to combine in each kind of verse qualities that most writers would have found inharmonious.

The paper closed with a *resumé* of the literary criticism which Breton has received during the past three hundred years.

Professor A. R. Marsh of Harvard University, who was to have read a paper upon "The discussion of Conduct in the Middle Ages," was, it is to be regretted, kept at home by illness. Dr. Tappan was, therefore, followed by Professor Richard Hochdörfer of Wittenberg College, who read a paper upon "Luther's 'Teufel' and Goethe's 'Mephistopheles.'"

Professor Hochdörfer based his investigations upon the Erlangen-Frankfurt edition of

Luther's works in sixty-eight volumes, and upon Goethe's *Faust*, referring especially to the editions of G. von Loeper, K. J. Schröder, and Calvin Thomas. Comparing the definitions that Luther has given of his 'Teufel' with those that Goethe puts into the mouth of his Mephistopheles, the writer pointed out their common characteristics. Both Luther's 'Teufel' and Goethe's 'Mephistopheles,' were shown to be conceived as authors of sin and death, being prompted by hatred and envy which is chiefly directed against God's creatures; both are pictured as man's accuser and reviler before God. After tracing these common characteristics in their literary prototypes, the writer reached the following conclusions: 1. that the first figure in literature which exhibits the constitutional elements of this two-fold Luther-Goethean conception is the devil of the apocryphal book of Wisdom; 2. that Luther's 'Teufel' is this devil as developed first by the Bible narratives of Christ's temptation and of Job's trial, secondly by theology, folklore and literature; 3. that all the biblical, mythological, theological, and legendary ingredients of Goethe's Mephistopheles are found in Luther's many-sided creation.

In the paper which followed, "Notes on some Elizabethan poems," by Professor John B. Henneman, of the University of Tennessee, two of the best-known Elizabethan poems were analyzed, Barnefield's ode, "As it fell upon a day," and Marlowe's smooth song, 'Come live with me and be my love.' Both of these poems, as usually given, Professor Henneman believed to be composite, and to indicate the process of development and growth that many poems of the Elizabethan era have gone through. The first part of the Barnefield ode has the true note of the lyrics, expressing the pathos of a ruined woman's heart. The second part is completely changed in spirit. It is didactic and singularly unpoetic in contrast with the preceding. Evidently a bi-section of the poem is warranted. There is just a possibility that the claims of both Shakespeare and Barnefield can be satisfied by giving the truer lyric to Shakespeare, and the addition with the didactic application found in Barnefield to Barnefield. At any rate, whoever the author or authors, the composite character of the poem is very evident. If further Barnefield's ode can be considered as a pendant and contrast to

"On a day, alack the day!
Love whose month is ever May,"

inasmuch as this latter (contained in *Love's Labour's Lost*) was written as early as 1590 or thereabouts, the former cannot be much later, and thus a date distinctly earlier than 1598 (when it appears in Barnefield with the addition) must be set for it. This view would increase the probability of the Shakespearian authorship of the truer original poem.

Similarly, Marlowe's poem appears in three forms, one with four stanzas in the *Passionate Pilgrim*; another with six stanzas, in *England's Helicon*; a third in seven stanzas, in Walton's *Compleat Angler*. The form with seven stanzas clearly results from a later addition. It is thought, too, that the form with four stanzas shows the true first form of a poem popular enough to be frequently copied and imitated, and thus added to.

Professor Henneman's paper was followed by a paper on "The relation of Drama to Literature" by Professor Brander Matthews of Columbia University. Professor Matthews protested against the tendency to judge plays too exclusively from the literary standpoint. There is a general tendency, he said, to judge other arts by the principles that govern literature, owing to the influence given to the art of writing by the invention of printing and the extension of writing. The printers have finally succeeded in their protest against a judgment of their work in accordance with the principles of another art. The orator and dramatist may well contend that an orator or a drama shall not be judged as literature only, but in accordance with the principles of its own art. Both are bound by the same inexorable condition; each must please an immediate audience. Their adaptation to that end must be considered first. Upon that, their prime virtue, their merit depends: their literary value, while it is obviously the condition upon which their immortality depends, is secondary. This adaptation to an immediate audience is an art in itself, and one not *per se* within the province of the literary critic, or at least one which he is bound to consider before rendering judgment. The fact that this art is necessary is an explanation of the shortcomings of the closet-drama.

"There is no more patent absurdity than the play that is not intended to be played. . . . A rough and tumble farce, hastily knocked

together by a variety-show performer, to satirize rudely some folly of the moment, is of more importance in the development of the drama than can be any string of soliloquies and dialogues, however poetic or polished these may be. . . . Nobody disputes that dramatic literature must be literature, although there are not a few who do not insist that it must be dramatic. The great dramatists have accepted the double obligation; and they have always recognized that the stage of the theatre, and not the desk of the library, is the true proving room. This double obligation it is that makes the drama so difficult an art,—perhaps, indeed, the most difficult of all the arts."

The last paper of the morning by Dr. T. S. Baker of Johns Hopkins University upon "The influence of Lawrence Sterne on German Literature" was read by title.

At the opening of the afternoon session, the Committee of Twelve, appointed a year ago to consider the question of entrance examinations in French and German, presented its report through its chairman, Professor Calvin Thomas of Columbia University. The committee had agreed upon a resolution to the effect that there is no reason for differentiating the amount of modern languages taught in the preparatory schools to students who enter college and to those who do not enter college. The chairman further announced the appointment of several working sub-committees, and recommended the appropriation of three hundred dollars of the Association's funds for the purpose of prosecuting the work in hand, which was approved by the Convention.

On the recommendation of the committee on the selection of a place of meeting for next year, the invitation of the University of Virginia was accepted.

The Secretary of the Association then read a memorial sent to the Convention by Senator Cullom of Illinois asking that it pass a resolution expressing its approval of the anti-ticket-scalping bill, now before Congress. A motion to lay the memorial upon the table was lost, and upon motion of Professor Cohn, the Secretary was instructed to return the memorial to Senator Cullom, with the statement that it was not within the province of the Association to deal with political matters.

The following officers were then elected for the ensuing year: President, Professor Alcée Fortier, Tulane University; Secretary, Profes-

sor James W. Bright, Johns Hopkins University; Treasurer, Professor Herbert E. Greene, Johns Hopkins University.

Executive Council—Professor C. T. Winchester, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.; Professor Albert S. Cook, Yale University; Professor R. Hochdörfer, Wittenberg College; Professor A. R. Hohlfeld, Vanderbilt University; Professor Bliss Perry, Princeton University; Professor Gustav Karsten, University of Indiana; Professor Charles M. Gayley, University of California; Professor J. A. Harrison, University of Virginia; Professor W. S. Currell, Washington and Lee University.

Phonetic Section—President, Professor A. Melville Bell, Washington, D. C.; Secretary, Professor George Hempl, University of Michigan.

Pedagogical Section—President, Professor F. N. Scott, University of Michigan; Secretary, Professor W. E. Mead, Wesleyan University.

Editorial Committee—Professor C. H. Grandgent, Harvard University; Prof. H. Schmidt-Wartenberg, University of Chicago.

Illness having prevented the attendance of Dr. P. B. Marcou of Harvard University, whose subject was to have been "Are French poets poetical?," the first paper of the afternoon was read by Professor W. E. Mead of Wesleyan University, upon "Color in Old English poetry."

The paper aimed to show in the first place what slight attention had been given in general to the use of color in poetry, and, in particular, pointed out that no systematic investigation of color in Old English poetry had ever been made. The following topics were then discussed: the great number of possible colors, and the lack of names for them; the indefiniteness of O. E. color words; the small number of O. E. color words; results of comparison with the mediæval romancers, Chaucer and Shakespeare.

The comparative lack of color in O. E. poetry does not necessarily imply a poor quality of poetry. In contrast with the small number of color words, the great number of terms in O. E. poetry may be noted expressing light and darkness. Over three hundred words may be found expressing light or brightness; over two hundred expressing darkness or shadow, or blackness. The ground being thus cleared, groups were made of the genuine color words,

—white, black, gray, brown, red, yellow, green, and numerous passages cited under each. Blue occurs but once. Red is not common, and with five exceptions, occurs only in the religious poems. It is not once found in *Béowulf* or in any of the other heroic poems, or in the lyrics. Green is, on the whole, the favorite color in O. E. poetry, yet, like red, it is not used. A comparison with Old High German and Old Saxon poetry followed, which showed that O. E. poetry held its own in comparison. A further comparison was then made with Old Celtic poetry as found in the *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, and with the Icelandic poems in vol. i of the *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*. Several notable facts came out in this comparison—the greater richness and definiteness of the colors in the Celtic and Icelandic poems being most remarkable. The most common Icelandic color is red, and one of the least notable is green. In conclusion, the remark was made that the color-sense in the O. E. poets was comparatively feeble, and that conventionality played a large part in the passages where color was used at all.

The paper which followed was by Professor Adolphe Cohn, of Columbia College, on "Professor Schultz-Gora and the *Testament de Rousseau*."

The object of this paper was the discussion of the claim to authenticity of a short work attributed to Jean Jacques Rousseau, and recently published by Professor Schultz-Gora, privat-docent in the University of Berlin. The title of the work, which is only twenty pages long, is *Testament de Jean Jacques Rousseau*. It is a reprint of a small pamphlet dated 1771, of which only one copy seems to be in existence, in the public library of Berlin. Schultz-Gora believes it to be authentic, his arguments being mainly, that the style is unmistakably Rousseau's own; that the ideas, which are in some parts very ably and clearly set forth, are also Rousseau's, and that the spelling is the same as that of Rousseau's own letters. In regard to the similarity of the style with that of Rousseau's, this is an argument which may be easily misleading, as it is entirely a question of personal appreciation upon which one may well differ from Schultz-Gora's judgment. We find, for instance, expressions in the testament, such as, "rompre ma plume," "le peuple comique," meaning the come-

dians, which we think Rousseau never used in his own works; but there are other arguments against the authenticity of the testament. First, we have here a book purporting to be published in 1771, and to give an account, or a defence, of all Rousseau's works, and yet it does not mention the *Confessions*, from which Rousseau began to give readings in Paris in the summer of 1770. Then in Rousseau's *Dialogues*, which were written a few years later, and in which the philosopher, then in a suspicious mood which almost amounted to insanity, defends all his life, acts and utterances, no mention whatever is made of the testament, or of the purloining of the manuscript of the same. Another argument is found in the Latin motto which is printed on the title page of the Testament "Qui notus nimis omnibus, ignotus moritur sibi." Schultz-Gora finds it very difficult to explain this motto, and the explanation he gives of it is very far from clear. The references to the passages in the testament induces us to believe that the author of the Testament himself did not understand it. That he was a very poor Latinist is shown by the fact that he fails to understand the meaning of Rousseau's works, "Vitam impendere vero," which he considers as meaning that Rousseau was ready to undergo martyrdom for the sake of the truth, while its meaning is simply that Rousseau wished to devote his life to the spreading of the truth. As Rousseau, though not a great, was a very accurate scholar, this alone would convince us that he is not the author of the Testament. There are, however, passages enough in the Testament which read very much like Rousseau's to account for Schultz-Gora's error, possibly they are reproductions of some of Rousseau's conversations. There are also some ironical passages directed against the inhabitants of the northern bank of the Lake of Geneva, which lead us to believe that the pamphlet is the work of some inhabitant of that district who was acquainted with Rousseau until the time of the latter's departure for England, and who found it convenient to hide his own identity under the shelter of the name of his great countryman.

In the third paper of the morning, "Recent Work in Celtic," Dr. F. N. Robinson, of Harvard University, gave a survey of the work done in Celtic philology in the past ten or

twelve years, taking as a point of departure a similar report prepared by Dr. Thurneysen in 1886 and incorporated in the address of Professor Skeat as President of the English Philological Society. (See *Transactions of the Phil. Soc'y.* 1885-6. pp. 385 ff.) He began with the Continental Celtic, and gave some account of recent investigations by both philologists and archaeologists in the Gaulish languages, antiquities, and religion, taking up then in order the insular Celtic races, and showing what advance had been made during the past decade in the publication of texts, in grammatical and lexicographical work, and in the study of mythology, folklore, and literary history. Special attention was called to some methods of investigation which promise to yield important results: to Strachan's *Studies in Irish Historical Grammar*; to Zimmer's discussions of the cycles of St. Brandan and of Finn; and to the comparisons between Welsh and Irish literature, made by Rhys in his *Hibbert Lectures*, and by both Rhys and Meyer in a number of articles in the *Transactions of the Cymrudorion*, the *Revue Celtique*, and *Archæologia Cambrensis*.

Dr. Robinson was followed by Professor William H. Hulme of Adelbert College, who spoke on "The relation of the Old English version of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* to the Latin original." The chief topics considered were as follows. 1. A brief history of the *Acta Pilati* in early Christian literature with special reference to (a.) their origin, (b.) significance and importance. 2. A short review of recent criticism of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*: (a.) Relation of Greek and Latin versions, (b.) Origin of title 'Gospel of Nicodemus,' (c.) Earliest editions of Greek and Latin versions, (d.) Tischendorf's (1853) 'final' edition, his theories relative to origin of Greek and Latin texts, and Lipsius's refutation of same in his *Die Pilatus-Akten kritisch untersucht* (Kiel 1871; second ed. 1886). 3. The *Nicodemus* legend in the early Latin literature of England, and its first appearance in Old English poetry. 4. The description and history of the existing Mss. of the Old English prose version of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, and a word for word comparison of this version with the Latin original. 5. The use of *þ* and *ð* in the Cambridge Ms. of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*: *þ* consistently used initially; *ð* occurring throughout the Ms. medially

and finally, except in words preceded by monosyllables beginning with *þ* and ending in a vowel, or preceded by *þ* (*þæt*), *ð* in such cases being regularly used in the initial position.

The last two papers of the session, "The French literature of Louisiana from 1894 to 1897," by Professor Alcée Fortier, Tulane University, and "The rhythm of proper names in Old English verse," by Professor James W. Bright, Johns Hopkins University, were read by title.

During the afternoon, the American Dialect Society held its annual meeting. At this meeting Professor O. F. Emerson of Western Reserve University was elected president; Professor John P. Fruit of Georgetown, Ky., formerly of Bethel College, vice-president; Professor E. H. Babbitt of Columbia University, secretary; and Professor Lewis F. Mott of the College of the City of New York, treasurer.

In the evening the members of the Association enjoyed a delightful reception tendered them by Provost and Mrs. C. C. Harrison.

The first paper of the session the following morning was by Dr. Frederick H. Wilkens of Baltimore, Md., upon the "Early influence of German literature in America."

The second paper was by Professor Edward Fulton, of Wells College, "On translating Anglo-Saxon poetry." The question has often arisen, What verse should be used in translating Anglo-Saxon poetry? but despite frequent discussion has not been definitely settled. The tendency seems to be decidedly in favor of imitating the original metre; but some still argue in favor of blank verse, on the ground that it is our natural "epic expression," and therefore the only fit medium in which to render such a poem as *Béowulf*, for instance. This argument, however, rests on the assumption that one so-called "epic expression" is essentially the same thing as another—which is, of course, absurd. Blank verse is not adapted to the style of A. S. poetry.

The *manner* of poetry—that is to say, the peculiar phrases, turns of expression, rhythmical movement, etc.—is just as essential an element of it as its matter, and in any translation that attempts to give an adequate idea of the original must be reproduced, if possible, as well as the *matter*. To give anything like

a true representation of the *Béowulf*, for instance, we must seek to reproduce its imagery and its rhythmical movement, as well as its ideas, just as in copying the Venus of Milo we must try to reproduce the pose of the head and the expression of the face. To the objection often urged that the A. S. meter is radically different from English verse, and therefore impossible of reproduction, the answer is, the fact is otherwise, for seventy five out of one hundred lines have rhythmical movements for which exact parallels may be found in modern English four-accent verse. As Schipper, in his *Grundriss der englischen Metrik*, has shown, the English irregular four-accent measure has strong affinities with the A. S. verse. Moreover, it is capable of modification so as to resemble the A. S. line still more strongly. Taking all this into account, it would seem that this measure—or rather a modification of it sufficiently like the A. S. to suggest it at once and inevitably, yet not so unlike the English line as to sound strange to the modern ear—was the proper one to use in translating A. S. poetry into English verse. An adaptation like this has been tried at various times, and notably by Dr. John Leslie Hall in his translation of *Béowulf*, but his translation, though the best of its kind, still leaves much to be desired.

Miss Elizabeth Woodbridge of Yale University, then read a paper upon "Boccaccio's Defense of Poetry; as contained in the fourteenth book of the *De Genealogia Deorum*." The fourteenth chapter of the *De Genealogia Deorum*, Miss Woodbridge said, is significant as being the earliest elaboration of the art-theory of the New Humanism. In it Boccaccio replies to the enemies of poetry; namely, the jurists, the doctors, and the theologians,—quoting and answering all their objections one by one. Thus the treatise furnishes a fair exposition of the way poetry was regarded by its enemies and by its friends.

Boccaccio's definition of poetry, which is in essential agreement with that of Dante and Petrarch, emphasizes, as regards its form, the careful ordering and disposition of words; as regards its content, the existence of a hidden meaning, an allegorical significance. The accusations against poetry, as summarized by him, are chiefly these: that it is a mere nullity, not worth serious attention; that it is a collec-

tion of lies; that it is either mere foolishness or it is morally baneful; that it is too obscure to be intelligible; that at best the poets are only "apes of the philosophers;" that we cannot disregard the authority of Jerome and Boethius, who condemned poetry, and of Plato, who would have had poets banished from his republic.

In reply, Boccaccio maintains that poetry is deeply serious by reason of the spiritual meanings hidden beneath its "veil of fable;" that it does not lie, since it does not try to pass for truth; that while some poetry is indeed morally hurtful, all truly great poetry elevates the mind and incites it to virtue; that the obscurity of poetry is commendable, since this enhances the value of the hidden truths, while it always yields them up to the earnest seeker; that the poets are not "apes of the philosophers," although their writings are consonant with those of philosophy,—rather, they are themselves philosophers; finally, that Jerome and Boethius and Plato have been misunderstood, for they meant to condemn only the bad poets, not such divine spirits as Homer, Virgil, Dante, or Petrarch.

One of Boccaccio's most telling arguments, and the one most frequently and most eagerly pressed, is the argument from Biblical writing. A large part of the Old and the New Testament falls under his definition of poetry; if, therefore, we condemn the "fables" of poets, we must also condemn the visions of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and John, and the parables of Christ himself.

In his attitude towards poetry Boccaccio was in no sense a pioneer; most of his ideas are found, expressed or implied, in the writings of Dante and Petrarch. But neither Dante nor Petrarch gave to their views so complete and so elaborate an expression. Moreover, Boccaccio emphasized rather more strongly and more deliberately than they had done, two points which especially characterized the thought of the times: the acceptance of poetry as a legitimate part of life, and the acknowledgment of it as independent of philosophy on the one hand, and religion on the other. Thus Boccaccio's treatise makes one in the series which begins with Plato and Aristotle, and comes down to Sidney and Shelley.

The fourth paper of the morning was by Dr. Kenneth McKenzie of Union College, on "A

sonnet ascribed to Chiaro Davanzati and its place in fable literature." Davanzati, a Florentine poet of the thirteenth century, was shown to be the probable author of the sonnet in question (Cod. Vat. 3793, no. 682). The words *corniglia* and *splai*, properly not Italian, are due to Provençal influence. The sonnet, a version of the familiar fable of the bird in borrowed feathers, was sent as an accusation of plagiarism to the poet Bonagiunta da Lucca; this fact accords with what Dante says of him. In fable literature this sonnet is important, because it does not follow the versions which were so common in the Middle Ages, descending from Phædrus, but belongs to a type older than Phædrus, and indicates the existence of a mass of fable literature in popular tradition; it is also important as being almost the only version of a fable given by an Italian poet of the time.

The paper which followed was by Dr. C. G. Child of the University of Pennsylvania, upon "Seventeenth Century Conceits." The Seventeenth Century Conceit proper was defined as a kind of perverted metaphor, displaying in particular perverse ingenuity of invention—over-elaboration, extravagance or even grotesque unfitness, counting for nothing beside novelty and a certain specious picturesqueness. The aim of the paper was to show upon the basis of an examination of one hundred and eight works printed before 1500, beginning with Tottel's *Miscellany*, and of all the notable authors after that date to Dryden and Milton, that (1.) under the influence of Petrarch and the Marinists, in the sonnet cycles beginning with Sidney's (and incidentally in the *Arcadia*), in some measure owing to the use of extravagant hyperbole, the inventional conceit was developed, its use becoming independent of the sonnet about 1596–1598, and that (2.) in the seventeenth century, active disposition to the origination of novel inventional conceits was almost entirely confined to the poets of Cambridge, other poets, where they use conceit, employing conventionalized conceits derived from the sonneteers.

The subject of the next paper by Professor F. N. Scott of the University of Michigan, was "Verbal taboos, their nature and origin." In certain books that have appeared within the last quarter of a century, Professor Scott said, attempts have been made to place a ban or

prohibition upon the use of certain well-known and much-used English words and phrases. These prohibitions, which may be termed verbal taboos, from their resemblance to the taboos of aboriginal tribes, are the outcome of antipathies which are formed in early years while the individual is acquiring command of speech. Such antipathies are common to all persons, being due to the associations which naturally occur in the formation of the speech-habit; but in the case of most persons they are checked or repressed by a sense of deference to the feelings of others in the community. There are some few persons, however, in each generation, who are unusually self-assertive in matters of language. Such persons look upon their personal antipathies as universal, and do not hesitate to impose them upon their neighbors. It is from these persons that verbal taboos proceed. The character and origin of these antipathies was illustrated by a number of examples, in part derived from a special examination in regard to the meanings of selected words.

The final paper, by Dr. C. R. Miller of Lehigh University upon "Prepositions in the works of Hans Sachs," was read by title.

During the day the Joint Committee on Entrance Requirements in English held a meeting to receive reports from two sub-committees, one on interpretation of the requirements, and the other on a list of books for general reading in the secondary schools.

Before adjourning to meet next December, at the University of Virginia, a resolution was adopted by the Association expressing its thanks to Provost Harrison and to the Local Committee.¹

CLARENCE G. CHILD.

University of Pennsylvania.

THE THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF THE CENTRAL DIVISION OF
THE MODERN LANGUAGE
ASSOCIATION OF
AMERICA.

THE third annual meeting of the Central Division of the Modern Language Association of America was held at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., on Thursday, Friday

¹ The writer desires to express his indebtedness to those who have furnished him with abstracts of their papers.